

c:fma\theory.ii

ELLSBERG, 7/16/91

PAGE

THEORY OF FAIT ACCOMPLI BLACKMAIL

DE: JULY 16, 1991. NOTES ON THE THEORY OF FAIT ACCOMPLI. FAIT MALACCOMPLI].

The attempted fait accompli is like the coup d'etat surprise attack but also like blackmail, like the coup d'etat and like the surprise attack it relies on speed which has a number of subsidiary requirements or characteristics. But like blackmail and primary(?) or trade it is also an alternative to violence. Violence as a form of power or influence affecting one's purposes or means of affecting one's purposes, it is a non destructive, unlike violence it is non destructive, it does not cause death, injury, physical pain or physical destruction of property. It is thus like the threats from blackmail, coercive rather than as a form of power, based on physical manipulation. It aims then to produce compliance or collaboration even though as in blackmail, that compliance or collaboration is induced by threat, primarily by threat rather than trade. In other words it may achieve collaboration in a situation in which the other party is in every respect or in most respects, worse off than before but collaborates for fear if he does not or she does not, there will be a still(?) \_\_\_\_\_. though perhaps mutually \_\_\_\_\_ along with the initiator, the threats so it is thus in the class, it achieves the effect of threat and it does this virtually by using threats. It may also use some small amount of violence and certainly physical movement but relatively small compared to other more violent approaches that are possible when compared to the ordinary run of events and compared to the violence that is threatened. Yet another way of looking at the fait accompli is that it shifts the burden or onus of first violence on to the other side.

It's as though a full scale theory, the fait accompli just emerged in my head as I woke which has twenty more dimensions than the one I had. Why is first use or first violence a special burden? Because either though a violent or non-violent move may be equally illegal or illegitimate. The destructive one or the violent one is usually treated or regarded as more illegitimate, as worse, it revokes greater sense, it is more to be deterred, subject to more guilt or shame or condemnation. Why is that? It not only does something which is forbidden, that violates rights but it causes physical pain, it destroys property, irreversible. It usually injures by-standers or innocents, more people that are injured otherwise by the non-violent means. More rights(?) in violence from generally the rights of others and the violation is regarded as \_\_\_\_\_ and irreversible. It is also regarded as more, in many instances, more humiliating, although that may or not be true. It



can in some cases be less humiliating because the fait accompli, surprise attack or other event which is less humiliating in its moderate or non-violence, may be more humiliating in making a fool of the .... The fait accompli also like the surprise attack, coup d'etat, various \_\_\_\_\_ in some cases blackmail, aims to prevent any \_\_\_\_\_ response, any effective response, any, what amounts to muscular movement or actual movement, action, real action by the victim. It may do this by paralyzing response or by taking advantage of the fact that response takes time and moving within the period of time that any effective(?) response takes so that the response is not actually a possible but impossible in time to prevent. What it is that's prevented? As I say it may be actually paralyzing that what is prevented is movement, the victim becomes incapable in a real sense of making a movement. This may be accomplished, may be aided for example in the case of this surprise attack by hitting or by destroying a man in control, so that centralized control in a possible alert so that information can hit sensors so that warning information is prevented that will cause or alert the attack in the complex sense in which information does cause a response so that one attacks is the awareness that the responses appropriate or needed or it may involve hitting forces or special links of access, bridges, roadways, the vehicles to forge the attack, the fuel links are either attacked or bribed into a \_\_\_\_\_ alert as in the Mafia case or in the Godfather movies, the bodyguard is typically either killed or bribed in the first stage. But, at any rate, these physical pieces of either bribery, threat, or instruction are instrumental to prevent any response in the larger sense or in a later sense by the combination of coercion, threat and other means because what is truly made impossible is for the victim to prevent a move by deterrence rather than physical destruction, confronts him with the possibility of averting or reversing his situation in which the opponent, the aggressor controls a place, set of people or a situation by preventing and precluding his having the physical capability to do so or by threatening him if he attempts to achieve that mission of control or power or authority. He will either have to do so by violence or he will meet. If he attempts it he will receive great violence. In other words, he will be, one hopes to coerce him. [TAPE CUT].

The aim now of the fait accompli, is to achieve the situation then where the victim cannot prevent or reverse one's control of a territory or area or situation by coercion but would have to undertake either trading or bribery or violence. Why is the violence still have an onus attached to it, a burden even though, in this case, it would be generally seen as legitimate violence, violence in the vindication of rights or the protection of rights. And the answer is that violence is bad in itself and not only worse, it's an illegitimate act but it can make an otherwise legitimate act, questionable, controversial or illegitimate because it threatens to harm, perhaps both parties, and innocent parties, third parties to a degree that is not justified by the vindication of rights or the reversal of a wrong. \_\_\_\_\_ introduced here the language of rights and presently of authority as opposed to the economist, which is not economist, as opposed to the economist



language of utilities even when that economist language is broadened by the awareness of coercive situations in which moves are possible and which not everyone is better off. But these are the questions of legitimacy and presently authority and rights is another language to describe this. Of course many of these dimensions are suggestive by the very name here, - accomplished fact - fait accompli.

[FOOTNOTE: WHY IS THIS ALWAYS PRESENTED IN FRENCH? WHAT IS THE ASSOCIATION OF THIS TO THE FRENCH LANGUAGE OR PRACTICE OR HISTORY OR EXPERIENCE OR DIPLOMACY? PERHAPS BECAUSE FRENCH WAS THE LANGUAGE OF DIPLOMACY FOR A LONG PERIOD. WHY WAS THAT AGAIN AS OPPOSED TO SPANISH, ENGLISH, DUTCH?].

There is an onus of violence. Why? Because it has an uncertain aspect to it so it shifts the burden of uncertainty from one side to the other. Also, it has an element of uncontrollability to it which is one reason for the uncertainty. It is, of course, destructive \_\_\_\_\_ and third parties as well. Tended to be mutually destructive since it is uncontrollable and uncertain, it has the potential for hurting both sides and possibly to a very large degree, an uncontrolled degree, it may be unstable, explosive, exceed normal bounds, go beyond boundaries, escalate to the mutual destructiveness of both and very specifically in the victim, initial victim. The consequences and even the actions are likely to be, to some degree, unplanned and uncalculated and ineptly performed and be different from what is intended. It's the difference then between war and threat or trade as was felt most acutely in the case of Iraq where even though everyone agreed that the initial move was unjustified, many, many people normally hawkish that is normally willing, sometimes even eager, to see violence used, were wary of violence as possibly even in the pursuit of right as possibly a worse evil, a greater evil than acceptance of the wrong or at least a very slow righting of the wrong during which many people would suffer and even be killed, killed by the Iraqis who were exercising effective authority. Now, we get to this question of the dimension of authority. These problems are associated to be effect a relatively coordinated attack. He could still have achieved considerable psychological effect, if he wanted, by an uncoordinated attack but at great cost to rational to accept.

Notice that in these various approaches of blackmail and fait accompli that one is confronting an opponent, a leadership and a followership, an armed forces or a police force, that is obligated to respond or defend or to punish or to destroy oneself under many circumstances but not quite all circumstances. On the one hand, the leaders are not clearly obligated to respond if responding would be a greater evil or would lead to greater evil than not responding, even though the not responding is in the circumstances, an evil. It's a bad situation. It's against one's interests. It has made one worse off but responding might be even worse so there is a necessity you want to create, a necessity defense for the authorities or the followers, a necessity defense for not

fulfilling one's obligations since one is legally or politically or morally or honorably obligated to do. The necessity defense is that doing so would be even worse, would be a greater evil or would lead to greater evil, than your non response for acceptance in this bad si